



REDACTED VERSION

Brasley

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

REGION VI
1445 ROSS AVENUE, SUITE 1200
DALLAS, TEXAS 75202

SUPERFUND BRANCH

DATE: 3/14/89

MEMORANDUM

SUBJECT: Potential Hazardous Waste Site - Site Inspection Report

FROM: Oscar Cabra, Jr., P.E. *Oscar Cabra*
Chief
Water Supply Branch (6W-S)

TO: Larry Wright
Acting Chief
Superfund Compliance Section (6H-ES)

In response to the CERCLA investigation reports which you recently sent to the Water Supply Branch, I am attaching our comments. Thank you for the opportunity to review these documents.

Attachment:

Site Name: Gray Job Corp
Site Location: San Marcos, TX
Site Number: TX 116163 0644

cc: Carl Hickam (6H-ES)

SUPERFUND FILE

DEC 02 1992

REORGANIZED

March 6, 1984

COMMENTS ON GARY JOB CORP SITE (TX1161630644)

Samples were collected at four wells near this site on October 19, 1988 and on January 25, 1989. The latter results confirm organic and inorganic contamination in three of the wells and indicate contamination at the fourth. All of the concentrations are less than MCLs and/or Draft Proposed MCLs. For one contaminant (1,1-dichloroethane) we have a verbal report (from Office of Drinking Water) on a draft Health Advisory that the lifetime HA will be close to the HA for 1,1,1-trichloroethane, i.e., about 200 to 800 ug/l (non-carcinogen). The concentration detected is well below this. Barium concentrations were confirmed in all four wells at about 10 percent of the MCL. Mercury concentrations were confirmed or detected in two of the wells varying from 25 to 75 percent of the MCL.

Analysis

1. For the (b) (6) Well No. 1, data confirm the presence of barium but not phenol. Cis-1,2-dichloroethene was not listed in the October sample report but was detected in the January sample at 0.005 mg/l. The presence of this contaminant should be confirmed by analyzing another sample. The current concentrations for barium and cis-1,2-dichloroethene are well below the MCLs, but this well should be monitored periodically, perhaps annually, to assure compliance with the MCLs.
2. In the (b) (6) Well No. 2, cis-1,2-dichloroethene was confirmed. Mercury was detected at 0.00155 mg/l whereas it had not been detected in the first sample. Both contaminants occur at less than MCL concentrations. This well should be sampled at 6-month intervals to determine continued compliance with drinking water standards.
3. Regarding the (b) (6) Well at Barn Sta. No. 8, confirmed contaminants were cis-1,2-dichloroethene, 1,4-dichlorobenzene, 1,1-dichloroethane, trichloroethene, mercury and barium. Tetrachloroethene was detected in the second sample, but had not been detected in the first. No contaminant concentration exceeds the MCL although they are close (about 80-90 percent of the MCL). The 1,1-dichloroethane (ethylene dichloride) at the concentration detected (5 ug/l) is not a problem based on the health effects information above. This well should be sampled at six month intervals to assure compliance with MCLs.
4. The (b) (6) Well at House Sta. No. 5 shows confirmed cis-1,2-dichloroethene and mercury, and the presence of 1,4-dichlorobenzene and 1,1,1-trichloroethane that had not been detected in the previous sample. Confirmation of the latter two would require another sample. No MCL is exceeded although the cis-1,2-dichloroethene concentration is 86 percent of the MCL.

Cont.)

This well should be sampled at 6 month intervals to assure continued compliance with the MCLs.

CONCLUSIONS

1. No contaminant concentration exceeds either an MCL, a draft proposed MCL or a health advisory.
2. None of the organic contaminants occur naturally in ground water. Each is an indication of contamination.
3. Each well is technically in compliance with the drinking water standards. Nevertheless, I recommend that each well owner consider either the treatment of his/her supply (via home treatment device) or the use of an alternative source. Possibilities for the latter would be a public water supply or bottled water. If owners continue using wells for drinking, they should follow recommended monitoring schedules.
4. Two (b) (6) Barn wells (A and B) were sampled in October. Only one was resampled in January. For purposes of this analysis it was assumed that well A was resampled. Request that Contractor verify which well was resampled as well as which wells are used as a drinking water source.

Edgar A. Jolley 3/9/89